

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application and for indicating that claims 3-7 contain allowable subject matter.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicant notes that the Examiner initialed and returned the IDS originally filed August 9, 2006 with two references lined through. The Examiner left a voicemail on October 4, 2011, indicating that the references were lined through because no English translation or equivalent thereof was provided by the Application. Applicant notes that the references lined through were included in the original International Search Report for PCT/FR2005/000257 dated August 8, 2005. As the ISR was provided in English, no English translation or equivalent of any references cited on the ISR is required. *See* C.F.R. § 1.97. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the additional two references be considered by the Examiner and another copy of the original IDS as filed with the Examiner's initials for the two references be provided.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1 and 4-7 are pending. Claims 2 and 3 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 1 is independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

Claim Amendments

Independent claim 1 is amended to clarify aspects of the present invention. Claims 4, 6, and 7 are amended to overcome informalities and for consistency with amended claim 1. No new matter is added by way of these amendments, as support is found at least in the originally-filed claims.

Claim Objections

Claims 6-7 are objected to for unclear language. Specifically, the Examiner states that it is unclear as to what is meant by “the signal from the detector is linear.” Claim 6 has been amended to recite that the signal is a linear function of the angular position of the detector. Accordingly, the claim as amended explicitly recites the parameters of the linear relationship between the signal and the detector, *i.e.*, the signal is defined as a linear function of an angular position of the detector. Regarding claim 7, Applicant has amended claim 7 to recite that the probe moves over a detection range. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that claims 6 and 7 are no longer vague or unclear. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1120626 (“Kono”). Claim 2 is cancelled by this reply; thus, this rejection is moot with respect to claim 2. Claim 1 is amended by this reply to include the allowable subject matter claim 3. Accordingly, this rejection is also moot with respect to claim 1, as amended claim 1 is now allowable. Accordingly, favorable consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 17286/006001).

Dated: October 5, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By Seema Mehta
for Jonathan P. Osha *56,235*
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
909 Fannin Street, Suite 3500
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant